DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 444 CE 073 083

AUTHOR	Jurmo, Paul
TITLE	State-Level Policy for Workplace Basic Education: What Advocates Are Saying.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. for Literacy, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Oct 96
NOTE	59p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Adult Literacy; *Basic Skills; *Educational Policy; Government School Relationship; Literacy Education; Policy Formation; *State Government; *Statewide Planning; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

A study determined how workplace basic education could be factored into state-level planning by collecting information from 41 individuals representing adult educators, state policy developers, union representatives, and employers in 26 states; 4 focus groups; and a document review. Findings indicated that, despite significant previous experience within and across states in providing basic education services for incumbent workers and a major thrust in state policy toward work force preparation, state-level work force development planners gave basic education low priority. Advocates for investment in workplace basic education cited these reasons for the lack of attention to the issue: external pressures on decision makers in the private and public sectors and problems with stakeholder groups. They identified the following elements of good policy: based on careful, comprehensive assessment; links workplace basic skills activities to other work force development; ensures the readiness of workplace education providers, employers, and unions; facilitates investment by employers, unions, and workers; requires accountability; and promotes collaboration at state and local levels. Guidelines for advocates were established: make advocacy a priority; build a core constituency; create an efficient communications network; clarify needs and resources; prepare recommendations and present a strategy to policy makers; and follow up and persevere. (Appendixes contain sources interviewed, states represented, and documents reviewed.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 402 444

State-Level Policy for Workplace Basic Education: What Advocates Are Saying

by
Paul Jurmo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Learning Partnerships
14 Griffin Street
East Brunswick, NJ 08816-4806
908/254-2237

October 1996

This study was prepared under a fellowship from the National Institute for Literacy.

The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the National Institute for Literacy.

CE 073 023

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Acknowledgments ... i

Executive summary ... iii

Introduction ... 1

Section I: The policy-making context: Who makes policy? Through what mechanisms? What motivates them? Where does workplace basic edcation "fit"? ... 2

What is "policy"? ... 2
What is "workplace basic education"? ... 2
Who is making policy and through what mechanisms? ... 3
What motivates them? ... 3
Where does the basic education of incumbent workers "fit"? ... 4
Summary ... 5

Section II: Factors blocking attention to workplace basic education ... 6

External pressures on decision-makers in the private and public sectors ... 6
Problems within stakeholder groups ... 8

Section III: Elements of good policy ... 14

1. Policy is based on careful, comprehensive, ongoing needs assessment at all levels. ... 14
2. Policy links what is learned from workplace basic skills assessments to other workforce development efforts. ... 16
3. Policy ensures the readiness of workplace education providers. ... 18
4. Policy ensures the readiness of employers and unions. ... 22
5. Policy facilitates investment by employers, unions, and workers via incentives and easy access to multiple learning opportunities. ... 23
6. Policy requires accountability and efficient use of available resources. ... 25
7. Policy promotes true collaboration at the state and local levels. 27

Section IV: What advocates are doing 28

Advocacy efforts already underway 28
Guidelines for advocates 35

Section V: Researcher's recommendations 39

The executive branches of federal and state government 39
Federal and state adult education agencies 39
National and state-level business organizations 39
National and state-level labor organizations 40
Adult education professional associations 40
The news media 41

Appendices

A. Sources interviewed 42
B. States represented in interviews 49
C. Documents reviewed 50

Acknowledgments

Thanks go to . . .

. . . The National Institute for Literacy for the fellowship which supported this work.

. . . Staff at the Institute and the 1996 Fellows for their technical and moral support.

. . . The informants who took the time to share their experience and insights.

. . . The Collaborative Learning for Continuous Improvement project (a National Workplace Literacy Program project funded by the U.S. Department of Education through the New York State Education Department) for the opportunity to learn from seven workplace education sites.

. . . Members of the Workplace Education Collaborative for keeping the workplace education fire burning.

. . . Participants in the NLA listserv for their good advocacy ideas.

. . . The Learning Partnerships board for their ongoing support.

. . . My family for their patience and other good things.

Paul Jurmo

Learning Partnerships
14 Griffin Street
East Brunswick, New Jersey 08816-4806
908/254-2237

October 1996

Executive Summary

State-Level Policy for Workplace Basic Education: What Advocates Are Saying

by
Paul Jurmo

Learning Partnerships
14 Griffin Street
East Brunswick, NJ 08816-4806
908/254-2237

Under a 1996 fellowship from the National Institute for Literacy, the author gathered information from 26 states to determine how workplace basic education was being factored into state-level planning for workforce development and what might be done to improve the quality of workplace education policy. The study found:

• Although most states have -- with prodding from the U.S. Congress -- established multi-agency bodies to plan their workforce development activities, few have made the basic education of incumbent workers a priority. School-to-work and getting people off welfare are getting the most attention and funding. Adult basic education -- particularly that of workers in the workplace -- gets relatively little.

• Many factors inhibit public- and private-sector decision makers from giving attention to workplace basic education. These include: upheavals (re-organization, downsizing) within business, labor, and government; lack of familiarity with worker basic skills as an educational or economic issue; lack of communication across government agencies and between government and the private sector; a "survival" mentality and resistance to taking on new policy challenges; and a decline in private and public funding bases.

• Despite these obstacles, advocates have identified the following "elements of good policy" which state-level decision-makers might adapt:

Good workplace education policy . . .

. . . is based on careful, comprehensive, ongoing assessment of the learning needs of the state's workplaces and workers;
. . . links workplace basic skills activities to other workforce development efforts like school-to-work, welfare-to-work, and job creation;
. . . ensures the readiness of workplace education providers through "seed-money" funding, guidelines, pilot projects, training, evaluation, and technical

assistance;
. . . ensures the readiness of employers and unions to make good use of workplace education resources;
. . . facilitates investment by employers, unions, and workers via incentives and easy access to multiple learning opportunities;
. . . requires accountability and efficient use of available resources;
. . . promotes true collaboration at the state and local levels.

• For such good policy to happen, leadership is needed from those who recognize the value of high-quality basic education for incumbent workers and are willing to become active advocates in policy-making forums. Such advocacy efforts are underway in a number of states, as workplace educators organize conferences, develop policy papers, and create networks for communicating about policy and practice. These efforts show that, to be effective, supporters of workplace basic education need to:

1. Make advocacy a priority.
2. Build a core constituency of committed stakeholders.
3. Create an efficient communications network.
4. Clarify the knowledge and skills needed by workplaces and workers, by workplace education providers, and by policy makers.
5. Prepare recommendations showing steps needed to create a workplace education "system" which efficiently responds to the above needs.
6. Present a strategic plan to decision makers and other potential supporters.
7. Follow up, persevere, and continue to press the case for a well-developed workplace education system.

• A number of stakeholders should listen to and act on the above feedback from the field: the executive and legislative branches of federal and state government, federal and state adult education agencies, national and state-level business and labor organizations, adult education professional associations,and the news media.

• As a commentator recently put it: "Maybe -- instead of a 'War on Drugs' -- we need a 'War for Education'." These stakeholders should recognize the need to strengthen and make better use of the knowledge and skills of all American workers. This should be seen as a challenge which we can deal with through new thinking, commitment, and collaborative effort.

Introduction

The following are findings from a study conducted by the author in 1996 under a fellowship from the National Institute for Literacy. The study attempts to clarify what might be done at the state level to create policies which help workers, employers, and unions respond to the basic skills needs of incumbent workers.

The study did so by asking representatives from key stakeholder groups -- adult educators, state policy developers, union representatives, and employers -- in twenty six states to respond to the following questions:

1. *What is the context in which state-level policy related to workplace basic education is currently being made? (Who makes policy? Through what mechanisms? What motivates them? Where does workplace basic education "fit"?)*
2. *What factors are blocking attention to workplace basic education?*
3. *What are elements of effective policy for workplace education?*
4. *What actions might advocates take to create policies more supportive of high-quality workplace education?*

Information was collected through interviews with 41 individuals representing twenty six states, four focus groups, and review of documents from selected states and national sources. (See Appendices A, B, and C.) Preliminary findings from this study were disseminated nationally via electronic listserves; three national conferences; and two state-level conferences. (See Appendix B.) Those communications helped shape further state-level action in several states and also provided opportunities for the researcher to collect additional information via informal interviews, focus groups, and e-mail exchanges. This final report summarizes some of those policy actions in Section IV.

This report represents a snapshot of state-level policy making related to workplace basic education in the period of spring and summer 1996. The author hopes that the findings will be studied and used by stakeholders -- especially adult educators and public policy makers, but also employers, unions, and workers -- who recognize (a) the value of high-quality workplace basic education as a tool for economic and social development and (b) the need to organize infrastructures at the state -- and national -- level to enable this important work to happen.

Section I

The policy-making context:
Who makes policy?
Through what mechanisms?
What motivates them?
Where does workplace basic education "fit"?

What is "policy"?

"Policy" has many definitions. The layperson typically thinks of policy as a formal strategy or set of regulations made by officials in a government agency or legislature.

Defined more comprehensively, "policy" is the decisions and actions through which groups and individuals set goals, allocate resources, and implement actions to meet those goals. Policy can be highly conscious and formalized or less formally structured and de facto. Policy is carried out within the public (governmental) sector and private (non-governmental) sector, or some combination of both.

This study focuses on the process and content of decisions which determine the quantity and quality of workplace basic education efforts within individual states. Due to limitations of time, the researcher looked primarily at formal policy as it is being developed within state-sponsored workforce development planning bodies. These bodies are typically some mixture of representatives of public agencies, employers, and unions. Further investigation might also be done of how workplace education-related decisions are made and implemented within individual companies and unions, within bodies which represent a number of businesses and unions, and within local-level workforce planning boards.

What is "workplace basic education"?

As used in this report, the term "workplace basic education" (also referred to as "workplace education") refers to activities designed to help currently-employed workers to improve one or more of the communication and thinking skills they need to participate actively in their workplaces and/or other life contexts. These basic skills include not just the traditional "3Rs" of reading, writing, oral English, and math, but broader, more-complex competencies such as problem-solving, teamwork, and research. These are competencies which numerous studies have identified as necessary for

active participation in the emerging American workplace. Workplace basic education activities typically are carried out in the workplaces in which workers work, but not necessarily so.

Who is making policy and through what mechanisms?

Since the early 1990s, states have been establishing variations of multi-sector workforce development planning bodies. These are vehicles for setting goals for, consolidating, coordinating, and maintaining the quality of a range of educational and other services to prepare the workforce for the requirements of the workplaces and economies emerging within states.

Such bodies typically have titles like "governor's workforce preparation initiative" or "state human resource investment council." These state-level boards oversee local or regional equivalent organizations which carry out similar functions (of goal-setting, etc.) at their respective levels. Membership on these state and local level planning boards varies, but generally includes representatives of state education, labor, human resource, and economic development agencies; the executive and legislative branches of government; employers; unions; and nonprofit organizations which provide workforce development services.

What motivates them?

Those setting up these planning bodies tend to be driven by anticipated federal requirements that each state have such a planning mechanism in place to facilitate consolidation and accountability of workforce-related services. During the period in which this report was written, the U.S. Congress considered -- without passing -- several versions of the "CAREERS/Workforce Development Act" which mandated establishment of such integrated workforce development systems in each state.

An underlying assumption of such legislation is that previous efforts to develop skilled workers, create good jobs, and place those workers in those jobs have not been very successful, particularly in low-income communities. It is argued that, in an age of shrinking public revenues and increasing need (especially for relatively-visible populations like immigrant workers), such workforce-development activities need to be made more efficient, typically through the adoption of "quality management" principles and practices. In effect, states are to "reinvent government" -- in this case to create a new way of ensuring a high-skilled workforce working in good jobs with good wages.

In their hurry to respond to these expectations, however, states are often confused about whom to include in the planning process, what workforce

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

development needs to focus on, and what types of policies to create.

Where does the basic education of incumbent workers "fit"?

The above-described workforce planning bodies are typically charged with re-organizing a number of services for in-school youth and out-of-school youth and adults. These components of the workforce development system are listed below, roughly in order of the attention and funding being given to them:

- *School-to-work activities (i.e., reform of the formal education system to ensure that schoolchildren graduate with skills required in local economies).*
- *Job placement of the unemployed (particularly "welfare recipients").*
- *Basic skills education and technical training for unemployed youth and adults.*
- *Technical training for incumbent workers.*
- *Basic skills education for incumbent workers.*

Most states surveyed have had some form of workplace literacy initiative since the mid-1980s. These initiatives were in many cases an outgrowth of major national literacy-awareness campaigns conducted by the electronic and print media and the advertising industries in the mid- to later-1980s. Another motivator was the implementing in the late 1980s of the National Workplace Literacy Program, a U.S. Department of Education project which gave grants to workplace education pilot projects around the country.

These awareness campaigns and federal grants led governors and other state agencies to set up adult literacy initiatives, and within those initiatives many states put together special efforts focusing on workplace basic education. Features of these initiatives include:

- *Some of these workplace literacy efforts were well developed and sustained, with state and/or federal funding, guidelines for good practice, staff training and technical assistance, evaluation, and development of other resources. Others were more modest, shorter-term projects consisting of short-term, modest grants with little or no guidance or other supports.*
- *Curricula have ranged from general (non-work-specific) basic education to instruction which focuses specifically on the literacy tasks faced by workers in their jobs.*
- *English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) is a high priority for many companies.*

In most states, it is adult basic education providers -- and especially

those who have worked in workplace settings under previous funding from state and/or federal sources -- who are showing the greatest concern about workplace education as a state policy issue. They tend to argue that the considerable experience gained in state- and federally-funded workplace education initiatives shows the value of continued investment in this field.

The policy makers -- legislators, policy analysts, governors -- involved in the above-described multi-sector workforce development planning bodies tend to fall into three categories vis-a-vis workplace basic education: (1) A small minority are proactively developing strategies for supporting workplace basic education; (2) about half have de facto incorporated workplace education into policy, but not in a systematic way; and (3) about 40 percent essentially pay lip service to the issue but are developing no clear strategies for dealing with it.

Organized labor has taken an active lead in promoting workplace education as a policy issue in about one-fifth of the states studied. Business leaders and adult learners generally are almost invisible in actively promoting this as an issue for state policy.

Summary

Despite significant previous experience within and across states in providing basic education services for incumbent workers, and despite a major thrust in state policy toward workforce preparation, it thus appears that basic education for incumbent workers is so far being given low priority by state-level workforce development planners.

Adult education providers are currently the most visible advocates for investment in workplace basic education. In a few states, organized labor is joining adult educators as active advocates. Other potential stakeholders are generally not raising their voices about this issue.

To use a currently popular phrase, workplace basic education is "not on the radar screens" of most policy makers. The following section summarizes possible reasons for the low profile of this issue which are being cited by observers of the policy scene.

Section II

Factors blocking attention to workplace basic education

Advocates for investment in workplace basic education cite the following reasons for the current lack of attention to this issue in state-level policy bodies:

External pressures on decision-makers in the private and public sectors

• Companies and unions are being pushed to deal with other pressures and opportunities. The stakeholders who are presumed to be most in need of basic education services have, since the mid-1980s or earlier, been responding to a number of pressures and opportunities. The net effect of those responses has been a setting aside of the workplace basic education issue, even in those companies which are aware that this might be an issue for them.

For example, when a company is downsizing its workforce (or preparing to do so), it is less likely to be thinking about investing in the basic skills upgrading of those workers. When workers are given an opportunity for overtime, they are likely to take it, even if it means not attending a basic skills program they otherwise would participate in. A company which is making investment in new technologies a priority is less likely to have the time to pay attention to the question of whether its workforce has a basic skills problem. And a company which can hire relatively-well-skilled workers at modest wages and with few benefits is not going to worry too much about hiring and training less-skilled workers.

For companies in the midst of such changes, worker basic skills is likely to be seen as a complex and longer-term problem which might be attended to at some time, but not right now. This is particularly true for small- and medium-size businesses which lack the training infrastructure of larger companies. Many companies appear to be retaining a "low skills, low wages" approach, perhaps justifying it as a strategy for survival and an alternative to closing down altogether and moving operations elsewhere.

Unions similarly have been pushed to focus on survival issues like retaining and recruiting members rather than the less-immediate question of how to help members upgrade their basic skills. This is despite the fact that surveys have indicated that members are often attracted to unions because of the educational benefits (e.g., ESOL classes) they offer.

• State policy makers are likewise often dealing with competing pressures to cut public expenditures (some states like Washington have set limits on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

public spending), "re-organize" (often through downsizing) agencies, and give priority to more popular issues like K-12 reform and "getting people off welfare." (Some observers see these competing issues as "cash cows" which distract the attention of potential workplace education stakeholders.) While those policy makers might acknowledge that worker basic skills is an issue which needs to be dealt with, they nonetheless -- perhaps without realizing it -- divert resources from the worker basic skills issue when they undertake the above measures, as shown below:

Cuts in public funding reduce or eliminate the resources needed to create an infrastructure for an effective statewide workplace education effort. In particular, adult education funds are in many states being cut back at a time when adult educators should be positioning themselves for increased activity. Potentially-vital resources like state literacy resource centers are being shut down or reduced to nominal shells of what they could be. Adult educators are often overwhelmed trying to respond to existing long waiting lists and are not motivated to create even more demand by branching out to try to serve workplaces.

Re-organizing (and downsizing) of education and other state agencies results in cutbacks in staff who have developed expertise in workplace basic education under previous state and federal projects.

An over-focus on consolidation and responding to block grants distracts policy makers from focusing on client needs.

Focus on "school-to-work" and "welfare reform" create the illusion that the workforce development needs of a state are being dealt with. Policy makers thus tend to overlook the facts that (a) most of the current workforce is already employed, (b) current workers will be the primary source of labor for the next several decades, (c) the skills of many of those workers are not adequate to deal with the changing technical and social demands of emerging workplaces, and (d) few employers or unions have the expertise or resources to understand and respond to basic skills needs within their current workforces.

• Some policy makers in state adult education agencies have noted the federal government's retreat from workplace education (e.g., the discontinuation of the National Workplace Literacy Program) and assumed that workplace basic education is no longer a national priority (or a potential source of funding).

• Many states have experienced two or three changes in administrations over the past ten years. This can lead to lack of continuity, as a succeeding administration might bring in a new slate of decision-makers who either don't

know much about good policy work already done or don't want to be associated with previous administrations' policy even if it was fundamentally sound. In some states, governors and education commissioners are of different political parties, resulting in lack of agreement over policy issues.

Some policy makers are hostile to education. Some observers feel that some legislators and their staffs have adopted and promoted an anti-government, anti-education approach to policy making. Publicly-funded workplace education is a foreign concept for those with such an ideology. Some workplace educators report that they are not notified of hearings or invited to participate on state workforce planning boards, even though they are primary experts on workplace basic skills issues in the state.

Problems within stakeholder groups

In addition to having to deal with pressures from outside, decision-makers in the private and public sectors are burdened by obstacles closer to home, often of their own making and things they might be able to do something about. These obstacles might be broken down into five inter-related categories: lack of understanding of the problem or potential solutions , turf and poor communication, a "reactive" mode, clashing values, and worker inhibitions.

Lack of understanding of the problem or potential solutions

• For many potential stakeholders, worker basic skills is a new issue. Decisions about basic skills-related matters are often left in the hands of people (e.g., legislators, policy aides, plant managers, union stewards) with little expertise in the field or with exposure to only one perspective. They might be interested in supporting a workplace education initiative in their companies, unions, communities, or state, but they simply know very little about the problem or potential solutions. In many cases, these stakeholders might be operating on outdated, misleading assumptions about "whose fault it is" and what needs to be done.

Few opportunities exist for these important decision-makers to broaden their understanding of the problem or possible solutions. This is due in part to a lack of literature and training opportunities and, in part, to their being unable to deal with workplace education on a full-time basis. (Many squeeze workplace education policy-making into other duties, and some do it on a voluntary basis.)

• Some states do very little evaluation of workplace education efforts already in place and little research to accurately determine real labor market needs. (Few states can provide even simple data like the number of workplace basic education programs in the state. Fewer have

surveyed employers and unions to determine the level and types of workplace basic skills needs within the state.)

Most states also still tend to rely on traditional measures of adult education program effectiveness like head counts and standardized test scores. Little has been done to develop and disseminate better ways to analyze workplace learning needs or measures which identify what impact programs are actually having on learners' ability to participate effectively in their families, workplaces, and communities. Nor is research being done to determine why learners drop out of programs: is it due to lack of interest or to competing demands from family, work, or other responsibilities? This lack of evaluation and research gives advocates and policy makers little evidence to build a strategy around and skeptics an excuse to avoid the issue.

• Many still define the problem as "individual worker illiteracy" rather than in more-complex, organizational terms. Many stakeholders continue to use a decontextualized concept of literacy borrowed from their own schooling and from literacy awareness campaigns of the past decade. In that view, the problem of workplace illiteracy is a matter of workers who never developed the basic skills taught in schools. To fix that problem, workers need to upgrade those skills and then use them on the job.

Some practitioners and researchers, however, see the problem in other terms. They argue that many workers in fact possess considerable knowledge and skills which they never use or use but not effectively, because technologies, communication mechanisms, and incentives aren't structured in ways which allow or encourage workers to use those skills to the company's benefit. For example, when a new computer system and user's manuals are introduced which are difficult for even the highly-educated to use, is it any wonder that a limited-English-proficient production worker would find it hard to use? Or if a supervisor runs a team meeting in a "drill sergeant" format and doesn't encourage workers to speak up, it shouldn't be a surprise that workers don't show "problem-solving ability." If a worker is not paid adequately for the work she does, it is likely she won't feel motivated to use the knowledge she already has.

The problem in such cases might be more that management is not introducing a new technology or decision-making tool in a way which enables workers to apply what they already know. To fully understand whether and how worker basic skills is a problem and -- if so -- what is needed to resolve it, it is important for organizational stakeholders to first determine whether the larger organization is a context in which all employees can use the knowledge and abilities they already possess. If, through a careful workplace needs assessment, it is found that the organization is in fact doing all it can do to provide such a context, then the question to ask is whether individual workers have the skills they need and are making the effort to use them.

Historically, those dealing with workplace basic skills issues have tended to focus more on assessing individual skills (often via a standardized basic skills test which doesn't examine the particular skills needed in the workplace in question) rather than on the more-complex and more comprehensive ("holistic") question of organizational readiness to support workers. Without a deeper understanding of the range of individual and organizational factors inhibiting worker performance, decision makers are likely to focus on only one piece of the problem -- the individual's skills. This is perhaps the piece which is not the most significant one in the larger scheme of the organization. Policy which results from a faulty analysis of the problem is likely to steer stakeholders to inadequate solutions.

• Procedures for applying for pockets of state funding for workplace education are sometimes obscure and cumbersome, imbedded in a number of uncoordinated funding sources, or simply not publicized. This inhibits interest and access by employers, unions, and local adult education providers.

Turf and poor communication

• Due to their lack of experience in the field or to bureaucratic barriers, policy makers sometimes compartmentalize their thinking. They don't see the relationships between welfare dependency, parents' inability to earn a living wage, school dropouts, adult illiteracy, and child poverty. They thus don't see adult basic education -- inside and outside workplaces -- as a tool for remedying those problems. In some cases, adult education is instead seen as a competitor for scarce workforce development funds.

• Various stakeholder groups (and sub-groups) have historically not communicated or collaborated well -- if at all -- due to de-facto "turfs" defined by values, funding sources, and identity. For example:

. . . Government agencies which deal with workforce issues but for different populations and under different funding sources sometimes don't share best practices and referrals;
. . . Lawmakers and governors of different political parties sometimes don't talk to each other or do anything to recognize the good work of their rivals;
. . . Union-based educators are sometimes reluctant to talk with management-based trainers -- and vice versa.
. . . Educators in a community college might not be willing to work with a non-college-based provider -- and vice versa.

As one veteran of bureaucratic in-fighting put it: Advocates for workplace education should recognize that the process for making decisions and allocating resources is "not always a rational one." It is "more typically a political process in which decisions are based on who you want to have the power rather than on an analysis of 'what's best.'"

• Communication within and among potential stakeholder groups is blocked not so much by "turf" as by simple logistics.

For example, there is no formal association representing workplace educators beyond a few informal state-level networks. Without such a network, workplace educators are left without a forum where they can share best practices and build a constituency for effective workplace education.

In some states,. communication is blocked by geography (e.g., a large land area, desert, mountains), making communication among those interested in workplace education difficult.

Such inadequate communication can lead to "turf"-related suspicion, a lack of willingness to collaborate, a lack of sharing and building on good work already done before, and -- ultimately -- a lack of progress in the field.

• While having a stand-alone workplace education initiative based in a single agency (like a state education department) has certain advantages, it also can have the disadvantages of being bureaucratically isolated, not tied in with and supported by other related efforts (which might have considerably more money), and simply unnoticed because it maintains a low profile "under a rock."

A reactive mode

• In some states, workforce development policy makers who don't have a particular interest in workplace basic skills as a policy issue are in a "holding pattern." They aren't dealing with the workplace basic skills issue because they don't feel mandated to do so "by the feds" or by any significant push from the grassroots.

Even those policy makers who are open to creating policy for workplace basic education are in a "wait and see" mode. They typically aren't clear what options are open to them in terms of fitting workplace basic education into the workforce development commissions they've set up. They aren't being proactive and thinking through what they want to achieve in terms of workforce preparation and economic development, where workplace basic education might fit in, and what infrastructure is needed to reach those goals. In short, such policy makers are not practicing the good problem solving and strategic planning techniques

they are ostensibly trying to get their states' workers to adopt. As one observer put it: "It's hard to teach old dogs new tricks."

• The pool of adult educators with expertise in workplace education is often, like companies, unions, and policy makers, in a reactive, "survival" mode. These largely-part-time professionals are scrambling to survive or perhaps have left the field in search of more-secure work. They thus lack the time or links to organize themselves into a grassroots advocacy bloc which can help create new forms of policy. They are prone to sell themselves short when negotiating contracts with employers or unions, thereby making it even more difficult to sustain themselves.

Many adult educators also might have -- without realizing it -- developed a defeatist self-image which undermines the creativity, commitment, and hard work the field requires. With such a self-image, workplace educators are prone to feeling that they are being self-serving if they ask for the resources they need to do good work.

Clashing values

• Workplace education efforts are blocked by clashing world views. Some observers argue that a "culture of entitlement" (or dependency) at all levels of the state system inhibits pro-active thinking and action. In such a system, all stakeholders are looking to someone else to provide them with answers and resources, take the lead, and make things happen for them. However, former systems of resource allocation are now being dismantled due to economic and political changes. Some stakeholders are now more focused on looking for resources ("What's in it for me?") than doing the needs identification and good planning which the relatively new problem of workplace literacy requires.

Conversely, some states seem to be guided by a "rugged individualism" and local control which hold that it's not the state's responsibility to give an adult an education. In such states, adult basic education is often given a low priority and little funding by the state itself, although at the local level there may be some efforts to coordinate services -- often volunteer-provided -- to meet the community's adult learning needs .

• Some adult educators are suspicious of supporting "high performance" organizational models. Some adult educators are wary of getting involved in efforts to create "high performance" workplaces because -- rightly or wrongly -- they associate that type of workplace change with "downsizing" and other changes harmful to workers. Some suspect that employers really want well-skilled workers who are willing to work for low pay (the "high skills, low wage" approach).

Out of fear of supporting something which might hurt workers -- or

out of fear of being associated with anything using the rhetoric of "high performance" -- some adult educators might be avoiding getting involved in workplace education altogether. This is despite the considerable expertise they have and the possibility that, by getting involved, they could shape practice and policy in this new field in a direction more consistent with the values they espouse. Workplace educators also need to think beyond traditional public funding sources and therefore be open to working with businesses.

Worker Inhibitions

• Workers sometimes feel inhibited from using available workplace education services. These inhibitions have many sources:

-- Some workers fear being ostracized by co-workers or being denied promotions by managers if they come forward for a basic skills program.
-- Some might need to work overtime, take a second job, or hurry home to take care of family responsibilities.
-- Some might not be able to stay after work because of transportation problems.
-- Some might have looked into the program and found that the content and/or format of the program is not likely to be of much help to them.
-- Some might see their future in the company as a dead end which won't be improved through participation in an education program.
-- Some might simply be "stuck in a rut," resigned to thinking of themselves as "no good in math (or English)."
-- Some might think of "education" in traditional terms and associated with past boredom and failure in school.

When workers don't make use of the services which public funders or their employers are paying for, decision makers are likely to conclude that this is not an area worth investing in. However, rather than write off this issue, policy makers should instead investigate why turnout is low. They should talk with workers and ask whether any of the above factors are inhibiting worker participation. If so, these are problems which can be dealt with through orientations, involvement of workers in the design and implementation of relevant learning activities, encouragement, and assurance that ridicule of those who take the risk of joining a basic skills program will not be tolerated in the organization.

Section III

Elements of good policy

The preceding two Sections paint a somewhat grim picture of the current state of state-level policy-making related to workplace basic education. So far this is not a priority issue for many policy makers, and there are many factors blocking attention to it.

The good news is that, despite these limitations, some supporters of workplace basic education have gotten involved on the policy front and managed to create, if not perfect policies, at least some elements of good policy. Listed below are seven categories of these good ideas gathered from across the country. Policy makers might adapt these elements to their own state situations to create infrastructures supportive of high-quality workplace basic education. Such elements of good policy might also be adapted within and across states into a set of indicators or standards for good workplace education policy.

1. Policy is based on careful, comprehensive, ongoing needs assessment at all levels.

• *Policy requires that workplace basic education efforts be guided at all levels -- state, regional/local, and workplace levels -- by careful, ongoing study of what stakeholders need and can reasonably accomplish. State-level planners should take a "bottom-up" approach by getting input from samplings of individual companies and unions from various industries, and then from regional and local workforce planning boards. Those local and regional representatives can clarify for state planners what local workforces need in terms of basic skills education and related services. Such an approach can ensure realistic, meaningful goals for workforce development efforts and avoid investment in "quick-fix," "one-size-fits-all" programs and activities which prepare workers for nonexistent or unrewarding jobs.*

A number of needs assessment approaches have been developed for decision-makers at various levels which can be adapted for use in this "bottom-up" approach to needs assessments. For example:

At the level of the individual workplace, ABC CANADA and some federally-funded workplace education projects in the U.S. have developed collaborative workplace needs assessment mechanisms. Various stakeholder groups within an organization clarify where employee basic skills fits into the organization's larger plan and where, therefore, basic skills-related activities can be integrated into the

organization's improvement strategy.

Rather than being seen merely as a clever marketing device to enable providers to "get their feet in the door" with employers, a good workplace needs assessment can help stakeholders understand the potential and responsibilities of setting up a basic skills effort. Information from a sampling of such organizational assessments can be fed up the system into local, regional, and state-level planning.

<u>At the local/regional level</u>, two models have been developed under grants from the National Institute for Literacy:

- *The North Carolina Literacy Resource Center conducted focus groups involving adult educators, learners, and employers in seven communies around the state. The groups have examined the role of adults as workers in the state's emerging economy which is increasingly reliant on electronic technologies. These groups are helping the Resource Center to develop content standards which programs can use to help adult learners prepare for their roles as workers. The result will be a list of skills (e.g., teamwork, ability to participate in cross-training) common across types of industries and jobs. Basic educators will be able to build curricula around these skills, customizing them to particular learners and the workplaces in which they operate.*

- *As federal funders have increasingly called for accountability for how federal literacy funds are spent, more attention has been paid to clarifying goals and setting standards for literacy programs. Special policy-development initiatives have been instituted in five states to enable stakeholders to set standards for literacy programs which were tailored to the particular needs of learners in those states.*

  Some of those states (e.g., Tennessee and New York) adopted a participatory process which borrowed procedures from the total quality management (TQM) approach to organizational development. Stakeholders have met to clarify who their "customers" are, what those customers hope to gain from enrolling in a literacy program, and how literacy programs and other institutions (e.g., social service agencies) might be restructured to ensure that customer needs are met.

  This process has challenged many traditional assumptions about what literacy students need and about the content and structure of services. It also pushed service providers who might otherwise not communicate to rethink how they might best meet the multiple needs of learners.

Such assessments can force policy makers to re-think what the term "workplace basic skills" means and what is needed to provide a well-prepared workforce. (As one source said: "We need to develop a common vocabulary, to bridge the chasm between different pieces of the workforce system, and to understand the constraints each of us faces.") A team of needs assessment specialists can be trained to do such learning needs assessments, tailoring them to local conditions (e.g., small businesses might not need as elaborate an assessment process as larger businesses).

These mechanisms for needs assessment and goal setting are also consistent with the high performance management principles which most workforce development efforts promote. Policy makers need to practice what they preach, be open to new ways of approaching workplace problems, and ensure that good planning practices are carried out at all levels of the workforce development system.

• *Policy promotes an "R&D" approach, encouraging workplace education programs to invest time in careful planning and then ongoing and end-of-cycle evaluation carried out by people with expertise in the field. Lessons learned in programs should be disseminated to others interested in building on previous experience.*

Rather than see evaluation as punitive or distracting and meaningless information-gathering, stakeholders should see it as a tool to enable policy makers to make informed decisions. All need to recognize that workplace learning needs and tools are constantly evolving and that thoughtful, ongoing study is necessary to keep practice relevant.

2. Policy links what is learned from workplace basic skills assessments to other workforce development efforts. *The above-described system of clarifying the basic skills needs of the state's incumbent workforce can be used to inform the planning of many other workforce development activities in a state and expand the numbers of companies and unions providing employee basic education services. For example:*

> *. . . A company involved in local school-to-work efforts might be asked to conduct a workplace needs assessment to clarify whether and how an employee basic skills initiative might be undertaken within the company. Such an initiative might be carried out as an "R&D" project with partial support from the state. The company might also send a representative into local adult education programs to (a) educate the adult education staff about the education-related needs of that company and (b) educate him/herself about adult education as a resource for the company and its workers.*
>
> *. . . Rather than wait for workers to be laid off before giving them needed training, local adult educators might be organized into pro-*

active workplace learning teams to give "at-risk" workers counseling, training, and educational services prior to scheduled layoffs.

. . . Adult education providers can work with employers who agree to provide jobs to unemployed adults under "welfare-to-work" programs, to conduct workplace needs assessments which clarify the basic skills requirements of the jobs in which the unemployed workers are to be placed. As necessary, the newly-hired workers could be given appropriate on-the-job basic skills-related services, to ensure that they succeed in their new jobs.

. . . Basic skills providers can help job-preparation services which are trying to prepare workers for new jobs geared to real community economic needs. Two examples:

> *• In Maryland communities where high-quality childcare (or eldercare) services are needed, job-related education and training are used to help potential workers in those industries to really be prepared for such important jobs. A basic skills team clarifies what the basic skills demands are of those jobs and ensures that those filling those jobs have the skills required.*
> *• In West Virginia, the state workplace education coordinator's position is funded jointly by the adult education and economic development offices. The coordinator puts extra energy into working with new businesses in the state to ensure that they have a qualified workforce to recruit from.*

In addition to having access to basic education, workers in new industries and workplaces should, of course, also be supported with appropriate wages, benefits, and recognition as valuable contributors to the economy.

. . . Basic skills providers can help improve the quality of technical training being provided to incumbent and unemployed workers by helping technical trainers to revise technical manuals and training procedures, and otherwise make it easier for low-literate learners to get the most from that technical training.

. . . Agencies serving small businesses -- especially those in rural areas where the pool of younger workers is not growing -- could develop special mechanisms (e.g., distance learning, multi-company learning centers, learning activities geared to older workers) to respond to those companies' and workers' special needs and conditions. Because smaller businesses tend to have greater employee basic and technical skills needs (e.g., they hire more new workers and have fewer training resources), special attention should be given to the education and training needs of small businesses by workforce development planners.

. . . Unions working with immigrant worker populations might put special emphasis on basic education as a member benefit. This might increase the appeal of unions to this non-unionized segment of the workforce. Similarly, unions might put new energy into expanding the educational opportunities open to native-born workers, as well, for similar reasons.

• *Policy ties workplace education into the larger system of efforts to create strong, equitable workplaces. When limited workplace basic education resources are used, priority should be given to helping companies and unions committed to high productivity, high skills, and high wages. "Rapid response" workplace basic skills teams should be created to promptly get customized needs assessment and instructional services to the above kinds of workforce development efforts. This rapid response can help employers, unions, and others in the workforce development system see the potential of well-planned, targeted workplace basic education.*

• *Policy discourages workforce development efforts from "creaming" the easiest-to-serve (i.e., those with higher-level skills who can be placed in jobs with little extra help) while ignoring other populations limited by low skills, childcare, transportation, or other obstacles. It is tempting for policy makers to go for the quick fix of "getting workers off welfare" (even if the workers aren't ready for their new jobs), giving better-skilled employees a "quickie" brush-up course (even if it leaves out lower-skilled workers), or providing education services only to those who can attend after-work classes because their childcare, transportation, and other logistical needs are taken care of. The result of such an approach is success for those who can participate and discouragement for those who can't.*

3. Policy ensures the readiness of workplace education providers.

• *Policy supports the creation and maintenance of a pool of well-equipped workplace education providers. Policy makers need to recognize that relatively few people have "done" the special work of workplace basic education and those that have often leave the field due to lack of job opportunities. Policy needs to build on the expertise that has already been developed in the field and create an infrastructure composed of . . .*

. . . funding for the above-described needs assessments, for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

curriculum development and instruction, and for the technical assistance and other supports shown below;

. . . *guidelines for good practice in workplace education. These would set quality standards which reflect real-world outcomes and not just traditional test scores and head counts. Examples include:*

- *The Labor Education and Research Center in Oregon has published a guide which is now used widely throughout the state.*
- *Massachusetts has identified a set of standards for good workplace education practice which those setting up programs refer to.*
- *In Virginia, a Workplace Work Group produced a manual organized around five themes: marketing, needs assessment, contracting, curriculum design, and staff development. The curriculum section identified a continuum of approaches ranging from student-centered to company-oriented.*
- *Kentucky has developed quality indicators for adult literacy programs which include a special section for workplace basic skills programs.*

. . . *pilot projects in which professional expertise and curriculum and assessment tools can be developed. for particular types of workplaces or workforces. Some examples:*

- *In North Carolina, a special ESOL curriculum was developed for Spanish-speaking workers who had recently moved to a mountain community to work in furniture factories.*
- *In Oregon, an "Ecosystems" project has helped timber-industry workers learn how to manage forest ecosystems via technical, business, and language skills training.*
- *In Pennsylvania, Philadelphia's Center for Literacy received a grant from the Pew Charitable Trust to provide workplace basic skills instruction for small businesses.*

. . . *training to include:*

- *shorter institutes such as . . .*

  . . . the summer institute offered in August 1996 by the Casco Bay Partnership for Workplace Education in Gorham, Maine;
  . . . workshops provided by Regional Literacy Coordinating Committees in Virginia;
  . . . the annual workplace education conferences once hosted by the Texas Consortium for Workplace Education ;
  . . . a 40-hour Workplace Education Institute operated by the Illinois Secretary of State's Literacy Office;
  . . . a statewide Workplace Education Training Institute in Louisiana;
  . . . semi-annual workshops in West Virginia, in which workplace education consultants discuss programs they've been involved in .

- *longer-term courses like . . .*
  - *. . . the certification program operated by Portland State University in Oregon;*
  - *. . . a course delivered over the Internet by the New York State Education Department with the state AFL-CIO..*

These training opportunities can expand the types of stakeholders involved in the field and broaden the kinds of expertise represented in it. Reading specialists, for example, might learn about the changing workplace to which workers are now trying to adapt.

. . . *evaluation tailored to produce meaningful, useful data about what programs actually achieve as well as what constitutes effective -- and ineffective -- practice. Information can take many forms -- narrative or numerical -- and can capture both "objective" and more subjective and anecdotal evidence. Evaluations should be tailored to the actual information needs of the stakeholders at each site, so that they can better understand and take ownership for their education programs. Feedback from such site-specific evaluations can be fed back to policy makers at the state level, to clarify the range of objectives, outcomes, capacities, and needs of local-level workplace education efforts. Examples to draw on include:*

- *The Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative has funded special evaluations for several years, with a special emphasis on team-based models in which local stakeholders take responsibility for evaluating their own programs rather than relying primarily on an outside evaluator.*
- *The National Workplace Literacy Program has built evaluation into each of the projects it has funded since the late 1980s. Expertise and tools developed in those projects might be adapted by state-level workplace education initiatives.*

. . . *ongoing technical assistance via clearinghouses, distance learning, and other means. (The Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative, for example, has developed tele-conferences and videotapes for workplace educators within and outside the state. In addition, workplace programs have access to the well-developed technical assistance system available to all adult basic education programs in the state. TA takes a "practitioner inquiry" approach. Practitioners are encouraged to first identify questions or problems they are struggling with; they then go through a process of investigation in which they develop answers to those questions through field research, literature reviews, discussions with other practitioners, etc.)*

As this infrastructure is created within a state, it needs to be based on study of developments in the field and continuously improved through evaluation of experience. Research and evaluation are seen not as punitive threats but as tools for building a system through communication, thoughtful analysis and planning, and continuous improvement. Where research indicates a particular segment of the workforce (e.g., workers in Chinese restaurants in small towns around a state) need a particular kind of adult education service, special efforts are made to link those workers with providers ready to serve them (e.g., volunteers living in those same communities who are flexible enough to adapt to the work schedules of the restaurant workers).

• *Policy promotes the use of instructional approaches which help learners develop the skills, knowledge, relationships, self-confidence, and interest in lifelong learning and continuous improvement they need to improve their lives in real contexts on and off the job. "Basic skills" is broadened to include the full range of SCANS-type competencies and responds in particular to such special employer and worker interests as developing computer-related skills and using statistical process control. Learning objectives are based on continuous input from learners and other organizational stakeholders. Instructors are shown how to provide instruction consistent with a team-oriented workplace. Examples:*

> • *The Center for Literacy in Philadelphia has developed a manual which shows how to customize a general literacy curriculum to particular contexts.*
> • *In Washington State, adult educators are focusing on the theme of "job-enhancement" in the group instruction provided in community learning centers. The argument is that, rather than try to respond to every learner-generated interest in a group, it is more effective to focus on the commonly-held interest of how to get and hold a good job.*
> • *In a federally-funded project coordinated by the New York State Education Department, workers analyze factors in their workplaces which block or enhance communication. In these analyses, learners not only identify ways of improving their workplaces, they practice group problem-solving, writing, information-gathering, and other skills they needs as active members of work teams.*

• *Policy encourages providers to be proactive "entrepeneurs." Given the general lack of understanding of workplace basic skill issues by employers, unions, and other stakeholders, workplace educators need to take on more-active roles to help broaden understanding and investment by those stakeholders. Policy should encourage (or perhaps require) local planning boards be open to adult educators, for example. Adult educators should re-think who their "market" is (i.e., not just people who walk in off the street to an adult learning center) and reach out to companies and unions to clarify needs and generate interest vis-a-vis employee education.*

This might require creation of special positions on workplace education program staff for workplace education "outreach workers" or "brokers". (Illinois, Virginia, West Virginia, Mississippi, and Washington are among the states which have created such positions in regions throughout the state. Massachusetts, New York, Colorado, West Virginia, and other states have state-level workplace education coordinators.) These specialists need to be "bilingual" in the languages of both business and education.

4. *Policy ensures the readiness of employers and unions.*

Policy makers should recognize that most employers and unions have at best a limited understanding of the work that has already been done to define and respond to the basic skills needs of incumbent workers. Employers and unions are generally not well equipped to make decisions about this issue. Rather, they see it as something unfamiliar and foreign and avoid dealing with it.

If this is to change and if employers and unions are to get involved in planning and implementing actions to deal with worker basic skills needs, policy makers should encourage and enable these important stakeholders to educate themselves and make informed decisions.

• *<u>Policy encourages employers and unions</u> to . . .*

. . . "do their homework" (through study of reports from around the country and beyond, through surveys of employers and unions, and through careful workplace needs assessments in individual companies) to understand (a) why employee basic skills is now a concern and (b) how workplace education is one component of a strategy to improve organizational socio-technical systems.

. . . balance education with other workplace changes (e.g., technical training, rewriting of workplace materials, training of supervisors, introduction of new technologies, pay-for-knowledge, employee ownership plans). Employers need to understand that a basic skills program won't by itself transform an organization. Even workers with strong basic skills won't perform well as problem solvers if the company is not ready to listen and respond to workers' good ideas.

. . . see such integrated programs as a means to not only improve productivity and quality but also improve employee morale and loyalty, safety, job-retention, promotability, interest in lifelong learning and self-improvement, and other elements of the quality of employees' life on and off the job.

. . . see a basic education initiative not as a one-time class but a system of learning opportunities geared to the particular, evolving needs, schedules, and interests of learners.

. . . expand their understanding of the term "basic skills" to include teamwork, problem-solving, research, and other broader and higher-level "SCANS"-type competencies. Avoid excessive focus on lack of "reading" skills, since reading is often of less importance in workplaces than other basic skills Avoid focusing on perceived worker "deficits" and instead emphasize and build on worker strengths. Avoid calling workers "illiterate." Avoid use of grade level measures designed for children.

. . . approach lifelong learning and continuous self-improvement as guiding principles for all employees at all levels. (This is in keeping with many companies' sense of social responsibility for their workers and communities.)

. . . educate themselves about the range of approaches to workplace learning which have emerged since the 1980s.

. . . work together with others from the same industry or geographical area to develop and deliver curricula focusing on learning needs they have in common.

- *To help employers and unions become better-informed and more-involved participants in workplace education efforts, policy makers need to create the well-equipped pool of workplace educators described earlier. Those educators can serve as resource persons and facilitators for employers and unions interested in becoming better informed and more involved.*

5. Policy facilitates investment by employers, unions, and workers via incentives and easy access to multiple learning opportunities.

To help employers, unions, and workers take the next step of actually investing their time in workplace basic education efforts, policy makers can take a two-pronged approach of (a) providing various incentives and (b) ensuring easy access to provider services.

- *<u>Policy considers a variety of easy-to-access mechanisms to encourage employer, union, and worker investment</u> in workplace learning. These include:*

-- *tax incentives for employer and employee . Some examples:*

> • *Illinois provides a tax credit which enables companies to deduct up to 2 percent of their training costs from their taxes. (However, this can require a lot of paperwork for participating companies, and some are thus reluctant to take advantage.)*
> • *Virginia has experimented with $500 tax credits for adults who earn their GED.*
> • *Georgia companies receive tax credits for one third the cost of education per full-time equivalent student, or $150 per full-time equivalent student, whichever is less, for each employee who successfully completes an approved adult basic skills program.*
> • *Alabama offers a 20 percent tax credit to companies operating employee education programs.*

-- *free educational services to companies which commit to job retention and advancement for participating workers,*

-- *fee-for-service policies in which, for example, a company gets one workplace needs assessment or class for free on a trial basis and then pays for subsequent classes.*

-- *multi-year funding cycles through which employers gradually take over funding for the program from the state,*

-- *state reimbursement of tuition payments made by employers or employees,*

-- *a nonprofit workplace education foundation (e.g., the Virginia Literacy Foundation) which can serve as a conduit for dissemination of funds to worthy workplace education projects;*

-- *public recognition of leading employers and unions:*

> • *Georgia offers two Governor's Awards for Achievement in Workplace Learning. The "Gold" Award is for organizations that have implemented a recognized workplace basic skills program. The "Platinum" Award goes to companies in which 85 percent of workers have reached agreed-upon levels of ability in reading, language, and math.*
> • *Ohio has a Governor's Workforce Excellence Award which goes to companies which invest in workforce learning activities. Many recipients have gone on to be active, visible spokespersons for the cause within the business community.*

-- *workplace needs assessment specialists who can help employers conduct solid workplace needs assessments before making any decisions vis-a-vis setting up an education program. Employers can emerge from those assessments with a better understanding of the*

potential of a workplace education initiative, a greater willingness to invest in one, and a greater likelihood to have a relevant, successful one.

-- "vouchers" which employers or workers can use to "shop around" for workplace education services. (Note that some argue that vouchers, while a potentially-attractive concept, need to be examined carefully; these skeptics question whether the promise of voucher funding would lead agencies to promise more than they can deliver to attract "customers." Others are concerned that vouchers might be available only to unemployed workers, thereby leaving out those who already hold jobs.)

Those considering developing incentives for stakeholder investment should note that employers often say that such incentives are not very important to them. They feel that the application process, requirements ("strings"), and other forms of "bureaucratic red-tape" make such incentives more trouble than they are worth. These employers argue that, if something is really important, most companies will be able to find their own resources to accomplish it rather than wait for government to provide them with a "carrot" to do so.

• Policy also examines existing sources of funding (e.g., lotteries, unemployment funds, a state literacy foundation, federal Section 353 demonstration project funds, Appalachian Regional Commission) to determine whether they might be tapped into for workplace education projects.

• Policy encourages true streamlining and coordination of services. To be avoided is the creation of new bureaucracies at state or lower levels which aren't really responsive to the learning needs of the populations and workplaces they are supposed to serve. Merely setting up "one stops" with services-as-usual (e.g., mediocre job training in one corner, under-supported literacy services in another) and cumbersome eligibility requirements is not effective. One-stop career centers should use case workers, careful referrals, and other mechanisms to see that learners don't fall through the cracks created when so many agencies are involved.

6. Policy requires accountability and efficient use of available resources.

• Policy avoids providing public funding to education providers, companies, and unions who don't maintain standards of "readiness" to fully support a well-planned education effort. If a provider, company, or

union initially qualifies for public assistance in setting up a basic skills effort but subsequently does not fully support the effort, policy should allow the funder to withdraw the public funds.

• *Policy encourages careful tracking of outcomes and encourages development of alternative measures (e.g., electronic portfolios) and cross-program tracking systems. One example from Tennessee: a participant in a job-preparation program will work with a case manager to develop a personal responsibility and work plan which shows how she/he will get a GED and work skills.*

Intended outcomes should be defined carefully before the program starts and as subsequent experience dictates. Affective outcomes (e.g., increased self-confidence and interest in lifelong learning) should be considered as legitimate, valuable outcomes, along with the kinds of "hard" outcomes (e.g., decreased error rates) typically expected of workplace programs. New measures should be adapted from the technical training and adult literacy fields, to ensure that programs don't rely on less-meaningful ways of tracking changes in learners' abilities and behaviors and impacts on the world.

• *Policy encourages existing state agencies to use their resources in support of workplace education. For example:*

> *. . . University research centers might do needs assessments of employers and unions or special populations (e.g., Spanish-speaking women garment workers) or might evaluate workplace education programs in a state. Education, business, and labor studies schools might focus on workplace education in their professional training curricula. Media and technology programs might develop distance-learning tools for workplace educators to provide services to geographically-isolated workers and workplaces and to workplaces and workers with common learning needs.*
>
> *. . . State agencies might promote lifelong learning for all state employees and customers.*
>
> *. . . State literacy resource centers might make workplace education a primary focus of their activities.*
>
> *. . . State education departments might use federal Section 353 demonstration project funds to pay for special workplace-related projects (e.g., South Carolina used 353 funds to establish a Workplace Center) and staff development funds for training of workplace education specialists.*

. . . Family literacy specialists might work with workplace educators to clarify how work and family themes can be merged and the boundaries between those two contextualized-learning fields reduced. (For example, some workplace education programs in Arizona serve not just a company's employees but their family members, as well, with childcare provided to participants' children. The result is an increased interest in lifelong learning within family units, with family members sitting around the kitchen table and doing homework together.)

. . . Specialists in other related fields like correctional education and vocational education might also investigate how they might cross-fertilize best practices with workplace educators.

• Policy avoids having separate and uncoordinated funding streams for workplace education-related services, so that providers aren't isolated from each other and instead talk with each other, collaborate, and share tools, contacts, etc. Coordination is further enhanced via use of easy-to-use computerized databases and Internet communications.

7. Policy promotes true collaboration at the state and local levels.

While everyone talks "collaboration," making it happen is not easy, given traditional, non-collaborative relations among those now expected to work together for workforce development. For example, adult educators report that they are often not given meaningful roles in the policy process.

All stakeholders should be encouraged to "speak up" when decisions are being made and not automatically defer to others who might hold power but don't necessarily know much about workplace basic skills needs.

Business leaders normally geared to "competition" might now need guidance to make the shift toward a "collaborative," non-domineering mode.

Government agencies which normally pay allegiance to separate funding sources should now re-tool themselves to collaborate.

Leaders of new collaborative boards should be trained as facilitators of a collaborative process, to ensure that the new boards aren't merely re-hashes of old, non-collaborative, closed entities.

Section IV

What advocates are doing

The preceding Section shows some good ideas which might be woven into state-level policy for workplace basic education. These ideas came from advocates who took the initiative to get involved in the policy-making process and from legislators and other "policy types" who listened to advocates' arguments and created new policies.

There are, however, relatively few stakeholders in the workplace education field who have come forward as advocates in the policy arena. Many former advocates at the national level (e.g., the Business Council for Effective Literacy, the Southport Institute for Policy Analysis, the AFL-CIO) are either no longer on the scene or have shifted their focus to other issues. Many other potential advocates -- including adult education providers, companies, and unions -- which have benefitted from government-funded workplace education services are essentially mute in terms of advocating for continued investment in this field.

Advocacy efforts already underway

However, a small number of leaders -- primarily adult educators -- in the field are taking steps toward creating new mechanisms for shaping policy which is supportive of high-quality workplace basic education. These leaders come both from within formal policy-making bodies (e.g., legislatures, state workforce planning boards) and from outside those bodies. Here are some examples:

Maryland

On June 24 and 25, 1996, the Labor Education Achievement Program ("Project LEAP," a federally-funded workplace education project run by the Maryland State Department of Education and the Metropolitan Baltimore Council of AFL-CIO Unions) hosted a two-day conference for adult educators, representatives of unions and employers, and public policy makers. Titled "Workforce Education and Development: Preparing Labor, Business, and Education for the New Milennium," the conference allowed participants to map out policy recommendations related to twelve critical issues facing workplace educators. The conference also had the benefit of building communication within and across the stakeholder groups, by helping people with an active interest in workplace education to communicate around common concerns.

Discussion topics included "who benefits from workplace education?", learner recruitment and retention, staff development, accomodating workers

with disabilities, affirmative action and gender equity policies, assessment and evaluation, how to get companies and unions to invest, English for speakers of other languages, new workplace technologies, union involvement, block grants, and one-stop career centers. Participants also heard from state-level policy makers and from others who have studied policy developments around the country.

Each discussion put a special emphasis on clarifying what actions policy makers needed to take related to the particular topic. Conference organizers quickly summarized and disseminated the discussions in a report, and a working group is developing a strategy for bringing those recommendations to policy makers. Many at the conference agreed that policy action is now needed because the federal grants they have been depending on are winding down and investments from the state, business, and labor are not what they need to be.

In addition to taking a lead at the state level, LEAP staff are communicating with labor educators in other states to expand the involvement of labor representatives in policy-related action. (Contacts: Cathy Hampton and Laura Chenven, LEAP, Maryland State Dept. of Education, 200 W. Baltimore St., Baltimore, MD 21201, 410/767-0516; and Debra Brown Felser, LEAP, Metropolitan Baltimore Council of AFL-CIO Unions, 2701 W. Patapsco Ave., Suite 110, Baltimore, MD 21230, 410/242-1300).

Maine

On August 27-29, 1996, the Casco Bay Partnership for Workplace Education sponsored a Summer Institute on the University of Southern Maine campus, where the Partnership is based. The conference covered both practice and policy, with the first day focusing primarily on policy-related topics like:

- *integrating workplace education, human resource development, and organizational development in the learning organization context,*
- *workplace education and economic development,*
- *downizing and the learning organization,*
- *business/education partnerships: the Chamber of Commerce perspective,*
- *unions and management: cooperative support for workplace education,*
- *creating and supporting good policy in Maine.*

Subsequent days focused more on practice-related topics like portfolio assessment, worker-centered instruction, and cultural learning styles.

Among other conference outcomes, a small group interested in facilitating further discussion of workplace basic education at state policy levels agreed to continue the policy-related discussions begun at the conference. It was also noted that the conference provided an opportunity for key players in state workforce policy to convene and get to better know

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the workplace basic skills issue and workplace educators. (Contact: Nancy Martz, Casco Bay Partnership for Workplace Education, University of Southern Maine, 220 Bailey Hall, Gorham, ME 04038, 207/780-5564.)

Massachusetts

Massachusetts has been a leader in workplace education policy and practice since the mid-1980s when far-sighted policy makers joined the forces of several state agencies to create the Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative. In recent years, two private-sector stakeholders -- organized labor and employers -- have created their own initiatives.

Roundtable: The Massachusetts Worker Education Consortium is a network of sixty people involved in the education of the state's unionized workforce who meet quarterly to discuss education from a labor perspective. Roundtable's volunteer steering committee and part-time staff, funded by the state education department, represent a union perspective in larger policy discussions and provide technical assistance to those setting up union-based education programs.

Roundtable encourages unions to negotiate for education and training programs to prepare workers for technological and organizational change. The group is also trying to bring several smaller unionized workplaces together to form a consortium which would share workplace education services. Unions are also urged to stay involved in the implementation of programs to ensure that workers get appropriate release time and are selected for participation in an equitable way.

In the past year, Roundtable did a survey of all State AFL-CIO affiliates and conducted follow-up interviews with fourteen union representatives and several educators with a special interest in worker education. This study demonstrated that the issue of worker basic skills is a union concern, particularly because unions recognize that strong skills are needed to qualify for and perform many of the jobs of the future. The Massachusetts Leadership forum (See below.) conducted a similar survey of the state's businesses, with the same kinds of findings. (Contact: Connie Nelson, Roundtable, c/o UNITE, 33 Harrison Avenue, 4th Floor, Boston, MA 02111, 617/426-9350.)

There are also two multi-stakeholder, statewide efforts to discuss and shape state policy, the Massachusetts Workplace Education Initiative and the Massachusetts Leadership Forum. (The Forum is a joint effort of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Education, and other institutions.) Both of these groups bring diverse constituencies together to clarify workplace basic skills needs and strategies. (MWEI contacts: Johan Uvin and Olivia Steele, Adult and Community Learning Services, Mass. Dept. of Ed., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5023, 617/388-3300. MLF contact: Lloyd David, Continuing Education Institute, 35 Highland Circle, Needham, MA 02194, 617/449-4802.)

Illinois

A number of state agencies have taken a lead in developing resources and policy for workplace education in Illinois. One, the Illinois Secretary of State's Office, operates a Workplace Education Institute to help adult education providers develop the expertise they need to provide workplace services. This Institute grew out of a survey of 13,000 businesses which identified the need for such professional training.

Another agency, the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, has issued a two-part report titled Learning that Works. Part I is a study of 21 companies operating employee education programs. The report examines company motivations, effective practices, and potential outcomes of such services. The second part recommends actions which policy makers in the public and private sectors can take to support high quality workplace basic education.

The Center also co-sponsors an annual workplace education conference whose participants receive summaries of available state and federal funding opportunities and copies of a journal containing articles on practice and policy.

In 1996, ILRDC issued "The Role of the Public Sector in Workplace Basic Skills Programs," a review of the Illinois Workplace Education Initiative.

The State Board of Education funds positions for workplace education coordinators who operate out of community-based organizations, community colleges, and local boards of education. These coordinators don't provide direct workplace education services; rather, they market the workplace education concept and help employers assess needs and decide whether and how to set up a program with local providers. The resulting programs are paid for by a mix of funds from employers and various state and federal sources.

Illinois also provides a tax credit which enables companies to receive up to 2 percent of their training costs deducted from tax payments. (However, at present this requires paperwork which makes some companies reluctant to participate.)

These services strengthen the expertise of stakeholders in the field while providing guidelines, documentation, and incentives for those involved in setting policy. (Contact: Suzanne Knell, Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, 209 W. Clark St., Champaign, IL 61820, 217/355-6068.)

Washington State

In the State of Washington, individuals within state government have taken a lead in bringing attention and resources to the workplace education issue. For example, in fall 1995, the Washington State Office of Adult Literacy invested $10,000 of federal 353 special project funds to hire a

university-based researcher to clarify who is involved in workplace education in the state. The study showed who provides workplace education services, the types of services provided, and the numbers and types of companies and unions which provide basic education for incumbent workers. This study has provided some numbers and facts to base subsequent planning on. The Office of Adult Literacy also provides a great deal of informal technical assistance and, with other Literacy Resource Centers in the northwest, a three-part training for workplace educators.

There is at present no state funding designated specifically and exclusively for workplace basic education. In two recent legislative sessions, bills were introduced to provide tax credits to companies for up to 75 percent of workplace education-related costs. However, in neither case were the bills passed. (One observer noted that such a tax credit might only be attractive to larger companies which have significant training infrastructures already in place. It is less cost-effective for a small company to set up a basic education effort from scratch.)

In 1992, the state's Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board issued a paper which defined the need for basic skills services for incumbent workers and made the case for increased public and private sector investment. The paper profiled workplace education initiatives in other states and concluded with four possible models of organizing workplace education services in the state.

Within the Board is an Adult Education Advisory Council which has recommended workforce preparation and family literacy as two concrete focal points for adult education. The reasoning behind this is that most learners are actual or potential participants in workplaces and families and that these are therefore contexts in which basic skills are particularly relevant and likely to be practiced. The workforce preparation focus can be carried out both in workplace settings and in general adult education settings where learners can strengthen skills they need in current or future jobs.

Policy makers are trying to make links between a number of workforce development services. In one example, clusters of businesses trying to shift toward a high-performance model are getting special help with loans, market-development, and ISO certification. In another, staff involved in economic development efforts and workforce preparation policy are trying to communicate on a regular basis rather than operate in isolation from each other.

The workforce board has recently drafted new recommendations which ask the governor and legislature to implement a new workplace literacy program modelled after previous workplace education efforts in Washington and other states. The program would include funds for increased staff development (via a Workplace Literacy Training Institute) and tax credits. (Contact: Donna Miller Parker, ABLE Network,1701 Broadway, Seattle, WA 98122, 206/344-4374 and Martin McCallum, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, PO Box 43105, Olympia, WA 98504-3105,360/586-0151.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Colorado

Colorado's Community College and Occupational Education System publishes a newsletter on workplace education and training, which brings the word to businesses, unions, and policy makers around the state. The Spring 1996 issue summarized a national study showing the need for workplace training and ideas for increasing the involvement of employers and employees in workplace education. (Contact: Mary Crabbe Gershwin and Patty Tank, Colorado Community College and Occupational Education System, 1391 North Speer Bovd., Suite 600, Denver, CO 80204-2554, 303/620-4000; Douglas Glynn, Workplace Education Consultant, Colorado Department of Education, 201 East Colfax Ave., Denver, CO 80203, 303/866-6936.)

New Jersey

In early 1996, the New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission (SETC) issued a draft report outlining its strategy for workforce preparation. While much attention was given to school-to-work-related activities, virtually no mention was given to adult basic education inside or outside the workplace.

The New Jersey Association for Lifelong Learning (NJALL), the state affiliate of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, mobilized its membership to make the case for investment in adult basic education. NJALL's legislative committee organized members to testify at SETC hearings and to submit written testimony to the SETC.

NJALL also hosted a "Government in Action Day" in which adult learners and educators travelled to the state capital to meet with legislators and representatives of goverment agencies. The NJALL delegates made the case for a renewed interest by the state in adult basic education. (Contact: Enrico Prata, NJALL Legislative Committee Chair, c/o Caldwell-West Caldwell Center, Ravine Avenue and Gray Street, West Caldwell, NJ 07006-7696, 201/228-2092.)

New York

The New York State AFL-CIO has, with other labor organizations, lobbied state government to fund workplace basic skills programs in unionized companies for the past ten years. Recently an AFL-CIO representative has organized a coalition of those who have received state grants which will serve as a voice for continued investment in workplace education as state government undergoes a major downsizing. Coalition members will be linked via a statewide electronic listserv and a professional development course carried on the Internet. (Contact: Bob Marino, New York State AFL-CIO, 100 South Swan Street, Albany, NY 12210-1939, 518/436-8516.)

Workplace Education Collaborative

The Workplace Education Collaborative is an informal network of workplace educators, primarily from northeastern states, who have communicated for three years via semi-annual meetings and an electronic listserv. In 1996, "policy" became a special focus, as WEC members met twice to discuss policy actions they could take at the state and federal level. In November 1994, WEC members issued a policy paper titled "Reinventing the NWLP," recommending actions which the federal government could take to improve its National Workplace Literacy Program. (Contact: Paul Jurmo, Learning Partnerships, 14 Griffin Street, East Brunswick, NJ 08816-4806, 908/254-2237.)

International Workplace Learning Conference

In spring 1996, over 1000 adult educators, union and business representatives, and government policy makers met in Milwaukee for an international conference on workplace learning organized by the Center on Education and Work at the University of Wisconsin. While much of the focus was on practice, a number of sessions dealt with policy issues, especially the role of workplace learning in state-level policy in the era of block grants. A number of speakers also argued for a renewed interest at the federal level in workplace education and training. A second annual conference is being planned for spring 1997, with special emphasis on policy. (Contact: Donna Manly, Center on Education and Work, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706-1796, 608/263-3696.)

Southern states

In September 1996, eleven southern states sent representatives to a unique conference of workplace education specialists held in Kentucky. Sixty specialists shared information, materials, and experience. A follow-up conference is now being planned. The U.S. Department of Education issues yearly updates on workplace basic education efforts in those states. (Contact: James Parker, Division of Adult Education and Literacy, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202-7240, 202/205-8270.)

Guidelines for advocates

The above examples and others like them demonstrate the importance of leadership in the workplace education field. They describe advocates who got organized, developed information, expanded their constituency, and made the case to policy makers who set the direction and allocate resources. These examples also show a number of steps which workplace education advocates can take to get involved in the policy-making process:

Advocates need to . . .

1. Make advocacy a priority. *Those more accustomed to operating at the level of "practice" -- planning and carrying out workplace education and other activities at the field level -- need to add "advocacy" and "policy-making" to their job descriptions. They must recognize that there are currently few champions for workplace education in the policy arena and that leadership will need to come more from the grassroots if this issue is not to be lost in the workforce development shuffle. Practitioners -- and allies within administrative and other levels of the system -- need to think of advocacy as something they need to be involved in on a daily basis.*

2. Build a core constituency. *Advocates need to recognize the value of working with other like-minded people to share ideas and resources in a coordinated advocacy effort. Rather than serve as heroic "lone rangers" on the policy frontier, they need to operate on the principle of "in unity, strength." This will likely require breaking down traditional barriers which have prevented collaboration within and across stakeholder groups in the past and agreeing on a set of principles and positions to guide a common effort. This unity is needed to keep the core group of organizers and doers together through the often-unpaid advocacy work which lies ahead.*

If possible, staff positions should be created for one or more professionals who can facilitate and coordinate advocacy activities aimed at expanding the capacity of the field. These coordinators need to be "feisty and persistent," as one source said.

Advocates might also cultivate new "champions" for workplace education among leaders in politics, business, and labor. A single, committed, high-profile advocate with connections to funders and other "movers-and-shakers" can bring much-needed attention and resources to the field quickly.

3. Create an efficient communications network *among those interested in serving as advocates. Possible pieces of such a network include electronic listserves; newsletters, memos, and press releases; fax and phone trees; mailing lists and annotated directories of contact persons; and periodic meetings and "summits" (held at convenient times). This*

network should be designed to get the word out quickly about needed actions and to facilitate discussion and actions.

Advocates need to also build on the experience of others in other states and at the federal level. This can be done through participation in conferences, Internet communications, and perhaps a professional association for workplace educators.

4. Clarify needs and resources. *The core group needs to conduct a sound analysis of learning needs at three levels within their state:*

(a) the learning needs of the state's workplaces and workers;
(b) the skills and knowledge needed by those responsible for providing workplace basic skills-related services; and
(c) what policy-makers need to know to be able to make informed decisions related to workplace education.

This needs assessment process will also help the core group identify others with similar interests who might serve as allies in the future.

With that needs analysis, advocates should also identify what resources (funding, expertise, facilities) already exist for workplace education. This will allow advocates to identify gaps between the need and available resources.

In this planning, advocates should educate themselves about emerging federal legislation which will impact direction and funding for workforce development at the state level. For example, workplace educators should be aware of U.S. Department of Labor grants which help states develop plans for one-stop career centers and position themselves to participate in such planning.

5. Prepare recommendations for policy makers. *Once advocates have a picture of what various stakeholders will need to have in place at various levels to respond to the state's workplace learning needs, they can prepare recommendations for policy makers. In those recommendations, map out a workplace education "system" whose ultimate aim is to help employers, unions, and workers strengthen and use the skills and knowledge which workers need.*

Show specific supports which policy makers need to provide at the workplace level and for the education providers , company trainers, and union educators who will be providing education services. Make it clear that the field needs minimum levels of support for it to provide quality services. and that those supports can come from a variety of public and private sources.

Encourage policy makers to on one hand require and facilitate accountability of any workplace learning efforts they invest in while, on the other hand, foster creativity and innovation through research and development.

In reaching out to legislators, governors, and other decision makers, advocates should focus on those who are most likely to be willing and able to provide the support needed.

6. Present the strategy to policy makers and others. *The core group of advocates should present their strategies to policy makers and solicit their feedback. Build positive, mutually-supportive relationships with those policy makers willing to work with you. Position yourself to shape policy at local and state levels through participation in planning boards and their subcommittees.*

At the same time, let others know what you are advocating for, to enlist their input and support for your efforts. You can thereby expand the constituency for workplace education through outreach to particular CEOs, industries, labor organizations, communities, and other stakeholder groups. For example:

- *In Alaska, native communities have shown a particular interest in adult basic education services, given their historical isolation from traditional educational opportunities.*
- *In New Hampshire, Chinese restaurants have worked with local volunteer literacy programs to provide ESOL services to immigrant employees.*
- *In Nebraska, the meat-packing industry is running ESOL programs for its heavily-immigrant workforce. In many communities, there is a small-town self-help ethic, with community members pulling together to deal with particular community problems. In some cases, companies help their employees succeed because of this ethic.*
- *In New York City, labor unions banded together to create the Consortium for Worker Education, which provides education services to union members and has pushed the state to fund workplace education programs at an average of $1.7 million in each of the past nine years.*

Educate the news media about workplace learning, showing them the many "angles" they can take to cover this issue. Discourage misleading coverage which sensationalizes the problem and suggests quick-fix solutions. If the mainstream media don't show enough interest, go to smaller media outlets which serve particular communities and audiences (including the business press).

Expand the pool of potential professionals in the field by reaching out to professional training associations, union educators, and university students. Figure out with them what roles they might play to "get their feet wet" in the field.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Follow up and persevere. *Don't give up if you don't get all you want from policy makers the first time. Be willing to negotiate but also be willing to take a stand critical of policies which you feel aren't supportive of good practice. Continue to press your case and revise it as necessary.*

Section V

Researcher's recommendations

The preceeding four Sections summarize what proponents for workplace basic education have been saying about state-level policy. In this final Section, the author suggests actions which various national- and state-level groups can take to support further discussion and action related to the future of workplace basic education.

The executive branches of federal and state government

There is at present a great deal of confusion and uncertainty about how the new state-level workforce development systems will work. Much workforce development legislation is still in the draft stage and could be strengthened through study of the kinds of feedback represented in this report.

At the federal level, the President and Congress can revisit the adult literacy and workplace basic education issue which was so prominent just a few years ago. As they prepare new legislation of the CAREERS Act variety, they need to take into account the realities and recommendations being cited by the field.

The same is true for Governors and legislatures at the state level. The National Governors' Association can recognize the importance of training and education for incumbent workers and put it on Governors' agendas as it is now doing with the welfare reform issue.

Federal and state adult education agencies

Resources for the governmental agencies which have historically played major roles in the adult education field are currently being jeopardized and/or cut back. Representatives of these agencies need to take more pro-active roles in educating legislators and other decision-makers about the potential for workplace education. Rather than merely asking for more money to do "more of the same", these agency representatives need to offer new ideas for "reinventing government" to create more efficient adult learning systems.

National and state-level business organizations

With the demise of the Business Council for Effective Literacy, there has been no consistent, prominent voice in the business community in support of investment in workplace basic education. Where are the many companies -- some of them in the Fortune 500 -- which accepted federal and state workplace literacy funds? Did they in fact see any benefits from the programs they ran? If so, why aren't they speaking up now to urge further public and private investment?

This report offers business leaders an opportunity to re-think the role they might play in advocating for investment in workplace learning. National, state, and local -level business organizations (like Chambers of Commerce and the National Alliance of Business) provide forums in which businesses can collectively clarify what their employee basic skills needs are and what might be done to deal with them. Considerable work has already been done by businesses on this issue -- both at the level of policy-making and in developing contextualized learning models. Leadership is now needed within the business community to learn from and build on that experience.

National- and state-level labor organizations

In some states (e.g., Maryland, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, New York) the state AFL-CIO and individual unions have taken a lead in promoting workplace education in policy discussions. Otherwise, organized labor is not grasping this as a major issue and a service it can provide to its members. Where they have been active, labor organizations have helped fill a leadership vacuum. The question of what labor organizations can do to take a lead on workplace education policy should be put on the agendas of labor organizations at all levels.

Adult education professional associations

State and national-level adult education associations and their members have become more active in the past few years in policy-making arenas. However, while family literacy, ESOL, correctional education, and other specialty areas have particular centers and associations advocating for them, workplace education lacks such an organized voice. Workplace educators might need to establish their own association or at least special interest groups within existing ones, to take the lead in the kinds of advocacy activities described in Section IV.

Adult educators should recognize that the recent 40 percent increase in federal adult basic education funding is a direct result of several years of sustained, systematic advocacy done via national and local groups and individuals who communicated and encouraged each other via meetings, conferences, electronic listserves, and other means.

Adult educators should also learn from past efforts (e.g., the National Governors' Association Literacy Exchange and the Gannett Foundation's network of state literacy initiatives) to create state-level literacy planning bodies. Four key ingredients of statewide literacy planning efforts were summarized by the Business Council for Effective Literacy (in its January 1985 newsletter) as follows:

- *All interested and affected groups in the state should be actively involved . . .*
- *Funding must be provided to cover operating costs.*
- *The councils must be adequately staffed.*

• The council should be as "turf-neutral" as possible so that its planning isn't handicapped by the preferances of particular vested interests.

The news media

The news media once played a major role in getting local, state and federal policy makers, as well as business and labor, to pay attention to adult basic education as a social and economic issue. ABC and PBS ran the PLUS campaign. The American Newspaper Publishers Association and other print-industry associations and companies got their members to cover the literacy issue heavily.

Although this coverage was too often simplistic and sensationalistic, it did lead to federal and other investments which have lasted until recently. Those investments are now being cut into or eliminated altogether, however.

The news media can play an important role in helping the general public and decision-makers in the public and private sectors to understand the importance of investing in lifelong learning in and outside the workplace.

As a commentator recently put it: "Maybe -- instead of a 'War on Drugs' -- we need a 'War for Education'." The stakeholders referred to above should recognize the need to strengthen and make better use of the knowledge and skills of all American workers. This should be seen as a challenge which we can deal with through new thinking, commitment, and collaborative effort.

Appendix A

Sources interviewed

Robin Asbury
West Virginia Workplace Education Program
1000 Virginia Avenue
Fairmont, WV 26554
304/367-1431

Patricia Bennett
Maryland State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410/767-0168

Laura Chenven
Labor Education Achievement Program
Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street, 3rd Floor
Baltimore, MD 21201
410/767-0631

Lance Davis
State Employment and Training Commission
New Jersey Department of Labor
CN 940
Trenton, NJ 08625-0940
609/292-1093

Terri Deems
Nebraska Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
511 Nebraska Hall
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NE 68588-0515
402/474-8331

Art Ellison
Adult Basic Education
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
603/271-6698

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gary Eyre
Division of Adult Education
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602/542-5280

Evelyn Ganzglass
Center for Policy Research
National Governors' Association
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, DC 20001
202/624-5394

Doug Glynn
Workplace Education Consultant
Office of Adult Education
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue
Dennver, CO 80203
303/866-6936

Jeff Gove
Division of Vocational and Adult Education
Ohio Department of Education
933 High Street, Suite 210
Worthington, OH 43085
614/466-5015

Miryam Jannol
Workplace Literacy Associates
6671 W. Fifth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90048
213/655-7616

Suzanne Knell
Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center
209 West Clark Street
Champaign, IL 61820
217/355-6068

Robert Knower
Office of Workforce Preparation and Continuing Education
New York State Education Department

Education Building
Albany, NY 12234
518/474-3302

Judy Koloski
The National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium
444 N. Capitol St., NW
Suite 422
Washington, DC 20001
202/624-5250

Ann Lessem
Quality Workforce Planning
Texas A&M University System
College Station, TX 77843-8000
409/862-4339

Martin McCallum
Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
PO Box 43105
Olympia, WA 98504-3105
360/586-0151

Robert McLaughlin
Vermont Workplace Education Program
235 Main Street
Montpelier, VT 05602
802/223-0463

Joan Malone
Consultant
53 Dove
Albany, NY 12210
518/433-0757

Bob Marino
New York State AFL-CIO
100 S. Swan Street
Albany, NY 12210-1939
518/436-8516

Nancy Martz
Casco Bay Partnership for Workplace Education
220 Bailey Hall
University of Southern Maine

Gorham, ME 04038
207/780-5564

Murray Meszaros
Adult Education Services
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801/538-7870

Donna Miller-Parker
ABLE Network
1701 Broadway
Seattle, WA 98122
206/344-4374

Gloria Grady Mills
Oakland Community College
17 South Saginaw
Pontiac, MI 48342
810/340-6841

Fran Mitchell
Employee Development
New River Community College
PO Box 1127
Dublin, VA 24084

Len Moore
Workplace Programs
Office of Adult Literacy Programs
Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education
1800 Century Place
Suite 400
Atlanta, GA 30345-4304
404/679-1625

Connie Nelson
Roundtable: The Massachusetts Worker Education Consortium
c/o UNITE
33 Harrison Avenue, 4th Floor
Boston, MA 02111
617/426-9350

Margery Oppenheimer
Literacy Volunteers of America - New Jersey
1 Racetrack Road
East Brunswick, NJ 08816
908/238-7889

James Parker
Division of Adult Education and Literacy
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-7240
202/205-8270

Gary Potter
Casco Bay Partnership for Workplace Education
220 Bailey Hall
University of Southern Maine
Gorham, ME 04038
207/780-5564

Enrico Prata
Caldwell-West Caldwell Center
Ravine Ave. and Gray St.
West Caldwell, NJ 07006-7696
201/228-2092

Wilburn Pratt
Kentucky Center for Adult Education and Literacy
1049 U.S. 127 South
Annex 3 & 4
Frankfort, KY 40601
502/564-4062

Tony Sarmiento
Assistant Director for Education
AFL-CIO
815 Sixteenth St., NW
Washington, DC 20006
202/637-5144

Barry Semple
Institute of Life Skills
124 Robinson Place
Shrewsbury, NJ 07701
908/741-6329

Lee Schore
Center for Working Life
3814 Southeast Martins St.
Portland, OR 97202
503/233-1698

Mary Dunn Siedow
North Carolina Literacy Resource Center
530 N. Wilmington St.
Raleigh, NC 27604
919/715-5794

Shauna South
Adult Education Services
Utah State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801/538-7849

Olivia Steele
Adult and Community Learning Services
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148-5023
617/388-3300, ext. 358

Pamela Wall
Louisiana State Literacy Resource Center
Governor's Office of Lifelong Learning/Workforce Development
PO Box 94004
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9004
504/342-2462

JoAnn Weinberger
Center for Literacy
636 S. 48th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19143
215/844-8910

Randy Whitfield
Basic Skills and Human Resource Development
North Carolina Community College System
200 West Jones Street
Raleigh, NC 27603-1379
919/733-7051

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mary Ziegler
Center for Literacy Studies
600 Henley Street
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-4351
423/974-4109

In addition to conducting the above individual interviews, the researcher gathered additional information for this study through the following meetings and conferences. Most of these events were summarized on the WEC-L electronic listserv. Electronic and paper versions of these summaries are available from the author.

Workplace Education Collaborative meeting: Amherst, Massachusetts, January 18-19, 1996.

New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission: Public hearing on report of Task Force on Education and Workforce Quality, Edison, New Jersey, February 29, 1996.

Workplace Learning: The Strategic Advantage: International workplace learning conference organized by the Center on Education and Work of the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, April 28-30, 1996.

National Workplace Literacy Program conference: Milwaukee, May 1-2, 1996.

Commission on Adult Basic Education national conference: Pittsburgh, May 16-17, 1996.

Workforce Education and Development: Preparing Labor, Business, and Education for the New Millennium: Statewide conference on workplace education policy sponsored by the Labor Education Achievement Program in Maryland, June 24-25, 1996.

Lifelong Learning in Productive Workplaces: Advancing Individual and Organizational Learning: Statewide workplace education conference sponsored by the Casco Bay Partnership for Workplace Education at the University of Southern Maine, August 27-29, 1996.

National Alliance of Business : National conference, Los Angeles, October 6-8, 1996

New Jersey Association for Lifelong Learning: Fall symposium, Edison, NJ, October 11, 1996.

Appendix B

States represented in interviews

Arizona
California
Colorado
Georgia
Illinois
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Nebraska
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia

Appendix C

Documents reviewed

American Association of Adult and Continuing Education (May/June 1996). ABE's changing policy landscape. Vol. 7, No. 5.

Anderson, James E. (1975). Public policy making. New York: Praeger.

Bergman, Terri (December 1995). Approaches to forming a learning consortium. Washington, D.C.: National Alliance of Business.

Cabinet for Workforce Development (1995). Indicators of program quality. Frankfort, KY: Author, Kentucky Department for Adult Education and Literacy.

Colorado Community College and Occupational Education System. Workforce skills: Newsletter of Educational Partnerships in Colorado. Denver: Author.

Evaluation Research (November, 1992). Workplace education: Voices from the field. Proceedings National Workplace Literacy program Project Directors Conference, September 1991. Washington, D.C.: Division of Adult Education and Literacy, U.S. Department of Education.

Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education and Georgia Department of Revenue (January, 1992). Georgia tax credit for adult basic skills education: Procedures guide for applying for, operating and certifying programs for tax credit. Atlanta: Authors.

Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center (1993). Learning that works: Basic skills programs in Illinois corporations: Policy report #2. Champaign, IL: Author.

Illinois State Board of Education (1995). The role of the public sector in workplace basic skills programs: A review of the Illinois State Board of Education's Workplace Education Initiative. Springfield, IL: Author.

Jurmo, Paul (July 11, 1996).Report on the June 1996 Maryland workplace education conference. East Brunswick, NJ: Learning Partnerships.

Jurmo, Paul (February 29, 1996). Comments on the January 29, 1996 preliminary draft report of the task force on education and workforce quality. East Brunswick, NJ: Learning Partnerships.

Jurmo, Paul et al (November 1994). Reinventing the NWLP: Recommendations for the National Workplace Literacy Program. East Brunswick, NJ: Learning Partnerships.

Maryland State Department of Education (June 1996). Workforce education and development: Preparing labor, business, and education for the new millennium. Baltimore: Author.

Michigan Jobs Commission. 1995-96 economic development job training program grant funding criteria and instructions. Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan WORKS! Michigan no wrong door system: Minimum standards. Lansing, MI: Michigan Governor's Workforce Commission

Neuenfeldt, Phil and Parker, Eric (January 1996). Briefing paper: Wisconsin regional training partnership: Building the infrastructure for workplace change and skill development. Washington, D.C.: AFL-CIO Human Resources Development Institute.

New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission (1996). Linking education and the workplace: An imperative for New Jersey's economic future. Trenton: Author.

New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission (January 29, 1996). Preliminary draft report of the State Employment and Training Commission's Task Force on Education and Workforce Quality. Trenton: Author.

North Carolina Community College System (1995). Basic skills in the workplace: 1994-95. Raleigh, NC: Author, Division of Academic and Student Services.

Office of Vocational and Adult Education (August 29, 1996 draft). Southern states workforce development report. Washington, D.C.: Author, U.S. Department of Education.

Office of Vocational and Adult Education (April, 1996). A state workplace education update: Selected program activities, program year 1994-95. Washington, D.C.: Author, U.S. Department of Education.

Ryan, George H. (Fall, 1993). Workplace literacy in Illinois: A private sector report. Springfield, IL: Secretary of State Literacy Office.

Schore, Lee at al (September 1995). A union approach to workplace education. Eugene, OR: Labor Education and Research Center, University of Oregon.

Stein, Sondra G. (July 1995). Equipped for the future: A customer-driven vision for adult literacy and lifelong learning. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Literacy.

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board. (1996). High skills, high wages: Washington's comprehensive plan for workforce training and education. Olympia, WA: Author.

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board. (February 1994). Building a high performing workforce: Increasing the basic skills of current workers. Olympia, WA: Author.

Zacharakis-Jutz, Jeff and Dirkx, John M. (Summer, 1993). "Unresolved Issues in State and Federally Funded Workplace Literacy programs: Toward a Rational Perspective and Policy." In Adult Basic Education, Vol. 3, No. 2., Pages 91-105.